

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-15, 17-19, 21-23, 25-34, 36, and 37 are pending in the application.

Reconsideration of the claim rejections is respectfully requested based on the above amendments and following remarks.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 112

The rejection of Claims 1, 23, and 34 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, was withdrawn in the Examiner's Answer dated December 19, 2006.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 3-15, 17-19, 21-23, 25-34, 36, and 37 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saylor et al. (US 6,501,832) in view of Cohen (US 6,859,776) and further in view of Cobbley et al. (US 5,614,940

Claims 1, 23, and 34 are the independent claims.

Claim 1 claims, *inter alia*, “an audio indexing system for segmenting and indexing audio and multimedia data obtained from an information source of a registered subscriber; and a multimedia database for storing the indexed audio and multimedia data, wherein the conversational portal maintains, for the registered subscriber, a program comprising multimedia segments in the multimedia database searchable by the client via a direct query of the indexed audio and multimedia data in the multimedia database.” Claim 23 claims, *inter alia*, “wherein the conversational portal maintains, for the user the program, wherein the program comprises portions of the indexed audio and multimedia data in the multimedia database in a predetermined order specified in the program.” Claim 34 claims, *inter alia*, “the conversational portal adapting

an interaction dialog with the access device based on the at least one modality of the access device, wherein adapting the interaction dialog includes adapting the interaction dialog to an audio modality and a non-audio modality; maintaining, in a multimedia database of the conversational portal, indexed audio and multimedia data corresponding to a content page of a registered subscriber; retrieving, by the conversational portal, the indexed audio and multimedia data of the content page from the multimedia database according to a user specified program specifying an order in which portions of the indexed audio and multimedia data are played.”

Referring to Claims 1 and 34; the combined teachings of Saylor, Cohen, and Cobbley teach a method for capturing a broadcast signal, storing the broadcast in a cache and retrieving the broadcast signal using voice codes. More particularly, Saylor teaches methods for registering voice codes associated with stored content corresponding to the voice codes (see Abstract) - the stored content being retrieved upon determining a location (see col. 26, lines 4-7), Cohen teaches a speech-enable sites maintaining a number of voice pages - a central server executes a voice browser which provides users with access to the sites using voice-activated hyperlinks (see Abstract), and Cobbley teaches methods for storing segments in a cache (see Abstract) - indexing information associated with the segments is made available to a broadcast device (see col. 12, lines 57-67). Cobbley’s method relies on the client to have a capture device for receiving a broadcast (see col. 3, lines 36-60). The combined teachings of Saylor, Cohen, and Cobbley do not teach or suggest a subscribing content provider, essentially as claimed in Claims 1 and 34. For example, none of the references teach a content provider subscribing to a conversational portal maintaining, in a multimedia database of the conversational portal, indexed audio and multimedia data corresponding to a content page of the subscriber.

Referring to Claims 23 and 34; the combined teachings of Saylor, Cohen, and Cobbley teach methods for searching content via keywords and the like. The combined teachings of Saylor, Cohen, and Cobbley do not teach or suggest a user specified program, much less that “the conversational portal maintains, for the user the program, wherein the program comprises portions of the indexed audio and multimedia data in the multimedia database in a predetermined order specified in the program” as claimed in Claim 23 nor “retrieving, by the conversational portal, the indexed audio and multimedia data of the content page from the multimedia database according to a user specified program specifying an order in which portions of the indexed audio and multimedia data are played” as claimed in Claim 34. The keyword searches of Saylor, Cohen, and Cobbley are not analogous to a user specified program. For example, a keyword search does not specify an order to portions of content nor an order for playing fetched results, essentially as claimed in Claims 23 and 34, respectively.

Claims 3-15, 17-19, 21, and 22 depend from Claim 1. Claims 25-33 depend from Claim 23. Claims 36-37 depend from Claim 34. The dependent claims are believed to be allowable for at least the reasons given for the respective independent claims. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

For the forgoing reasons, the application, including Claims 1, 3-15, 17-19, 21-23, 25-34, 36, and 37, is believed to be in condition for allowance. Early and favorable reconsideration of the case is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: April 21, 2008

By: /Nathaniel T. Wallace/

Nathaniel T. Wallace
Reg. No. 48,909
Attorney for Applicant(s)

Mailing Address:
F. CHAU & ASSOCIATES, LLC
130 Woodbury Road
Woodbury, New York 11797
TEL: (516) 692-8888
FAX: (516) 692-8889